

REMARKS

Claims 25-32 and 39-41 remain in the application. Claims 25 and 27 have been amended, and claims 1-24 and 33-38 have been canceled.

Claims 2, 10, 12, 21, and 22 stand objected to based upon the inclusion therein of certain formalities. Applicant respectfully submits the objection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063). Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,663,964). Applicant respectfully traverses the above-recited rejection on the basis claims 25 and 27 have been amended to recite that only the fishing line passes through the aperture in the tail of the lure. Martin discloses an artificial shrimp lure including a tail segment 3 with an opening 9. The opening 9 is included in the tail segment 3 to permit a leader 8 to pass through, which is then secured to a line on a rod or pole. Martin accordingly fails to disclose a fishing line passing through an aperture as Martin discloses only that the leader 8 passes through the opening 9. Applicant accordingly respectfully submits Martin cannot anticipate claims 25 and 27 because Martin fails to disclose Applicant's claimed feature of the fishing line passing through the aperture. Applicant further respectfully submits that it is not possible for a line on a rod or pole to pass through the opening 9 because that would necessitate the elimination of the leader 8, which is required as a support platform for the artificial shrimp lure of Martin. Applicant

therefore respectfully submits claims 25 and 27 are patentable over Martin.

Claims 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Cannon (U.S. Patent No. 4,771,567). Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063) or Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,663,964), or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063) or Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,663,964). Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063) as applied to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 12-22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063). Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claims 26, 28, 30, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,663,964) as applied to claim 25.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above-recited rejection with respect to claims 26 and 28 based upon the preceding arguments regarding claim 25 and the dependence of claims 26 and 28 therefrom.

With respect to claim 30, the Examiner asserts the addition of a sleeve to the artificial shrimp lure of Martin would be obvious because it is well known to use sleeves in guiding shafts through apertures. Responsive thereto, Applicant respectfully submits claim 30 recites a sleeve coupled with a tail of a lure, wherein the sleeve receives a fishing line therethrough. Applicant's

sleeve thus provides a passage for the fishing line through the tail of the lure before being connected to a hook secured to a body of the lure. Applicant respectfully submits Martin simply does not provide any disclosure that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a sleeve for the purpose of providing a passage for a fishing line through a tail of a lure. Martin discloses only that a leader 8 may pass through an opening 9 prior to connection to a line of a rod or pole. Consequently, even if a sleeve were placed in the opening 9 of Martin, Martin would still only disclose an artificial shrimp lure including a leader 8 passing through a sleeve prior to connection of the leader 8 to a line of a rod or pole. Accordingly, even after the modification suggested by the Examiner, the artificial shrimp lure of Martin does not disclose Applicant's sleeve that facilitates the passing of a fishing line through a tail of a lure. Applicant therefore respectfully submits Martin does not render claim 30 obvious.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above-recited rejection with respect to claim 39 based upon the preceding arguments regarding claim 30 and the dependence of claim 39 therefrom.

Claims 11 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063) in view of Cannon (U.S. Patent No. 4,771,567). Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claims is now moot in view of their cancellation.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,663,964) in view of Cannon (U.S. Patent No. 4,771,567). Applicant respectfully traverses the above-recited rejection with respect to claim 29 based upon the preceding arguments regarding claim 25 and the dependence of claim 29 therefrom.

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) by Cannon (U.S. Patent No. 4,771,567). Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of the above claim is now moot in view

of its cancellation.

Claims 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,770,063) or Martin (U.S. Patent No. 2,663,964). Applicant respectfully traverses the above-recited rejection based upon the preceding arguments with respect to claim 30. Neither Martin reference provides any disclosure that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a sleeve for the purpose of providing a passage for a fishing line through a tail of a lure. Both Martin references disclose only that a leader may pass through an opening prior to connection to a line of a rod or pole. Consequently, even if a sleeve were placed in the openings of shown in the Martin references, the Martin references would still only disclose artificial shrimp lures including leaders passing through a sleeve prior to connection of the leaders to a line of a rod or pole. Accordingly, even after the modification suggested by the Examiner, the artificial shrimp lures of both Martin references do not disclose Applicant's sleeve that facilitates the passing of a fishing line through a tail of a lure. Applicant therefore respectfully submits neither Martin reference renders claim 30 obvious.

The prior art made of record has been reviewed by Applicant and is deemed not to anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and earnestly solicits early allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTOPHER L. MAKAY
1634 Milam Building
115 East Travis Street
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(210) 472-3535

DATE: 28 August 2003

BY: 

Christopher L. Makay
Reg. No. 34,475

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated below, addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail No. EL 979136950 US

Date: 28 August 2003


Christopher L. Makay